



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X
SAEEDA A. MAHMUD, M.D.,
Plaintiff,

- against -

WALTER KAUFMANN, M.D. et al,
Defendants.

05 Civ. 8090 (DAB)
ADOPTION OF REPORT
AND RECOMMENDATION

-----X
DEBORAH A. BATTS, United States District Judge.

This matter is before the Court upon the April 15, 2010 Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge James L. Cott (the "Report"). Judge Cott's Report recommends that the Court deny Defendants' Motion for Costs and Attorney's Fees. (Report at 8-9.)

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), "[w]ithin fourteen days after being served with a copy [of a Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation], any party may serve and file written objections to such proposed findings and recommendations..." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); see also Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). The district court may adopt those portions of the report to which no timely objection has been made, so long as there is no clear error on the face of the record. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A); Wilds v. United Parcel Serv., Inc., 262 F.Supp.2d 163, 169 (S.D.N.Y.

2003). To date, no objections to the Report have been filed.¹

Having reviewed the Report and finding no clear error on the face of the record, it is hereby

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED as follows:

1. The Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge James L. Cott dated April 15, 2010 be and the same hereby is APPROVED, ADOPTED, and RATIFIED by the Court in its entirety;

2. The Clerk is DIRECTED to strike Defendants' Motion to Extend Time to File Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs (Docket No. 78); and

3. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close the docket in this case and terminate all pending Motions, including those under Docket Nos. 63 and 78.

SO ORDERED.

DATED: New York, New York
May 21, 2010


DEBORAH A. BATTS
United States District Judge

May 21, 2010

¹ As Judge Cott notes in Footnote 4 of his Report, Defendants filed a separate "Motion to Extend Time to File Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs." This motion is duplicative of the motion previously filed by Defendants at Docket No. 63 and it is unnecessary for the Court to consider the motion further.